



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/789,330	02/26/2004	Sung-Ki Jung	1190860-991460	9372
32605	7590	07/12/2007	EXAMINER	
MACPHERSON KWOK CHEN & HEID LLP			TADESSE, YEWEBDAR T	
2033 GATEWAY PLACE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 400			1734	
SAN JOSE, CA 95110				

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/12/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.	JUNG ET AL.	Applicant(s)
10/789,330	Art Unit	1734

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 27 June 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies; (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because

(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: 8.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-7 and 9.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.
 13. Other: _____.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Examiner withdraws the inappropriately applied 112 rejection of claim 8. However, claims 1-7 and 9 are rejectable over Akimoto and Hasebe et al alone and/or in view of Park et al or Sakai et al. As described on the Final action dated 03/30/2007, Akimoto's lid (36) covers the bottom face of the receiving recession of the cleaning unit and capable of eliminating dregs of the material attached on the slit nozzle. Applicants argue that in Akimoto the lid 36 serves different function from that of applicants' function (eliminating dregs of material attached on the slit nozzle). Examiner respectfully disagrees because Akimoto's cleaning member (lid 36) and the cleaning unit (see Fig 7) are capable of eliminating dregs of material attached on the slit nozzle by keeping the nozzle ports wet -preventing the resist liquid from being dried within the nozzles' passages and by protecting the nozzle ports from the outside atmosphere, thereby preventing adhesion of particles (see column 5, lines 61-67 and column 6, lines 57-60). As to applicants' argument that Hasebe et al does not show a cleaning member and "a bottom face". Examiner respectfully disagrees because in the sectional view of Fig. 11-12, Hasebe et al shows a cleaning unit (cleaning mechanism 80) having a body (in the form of container, with receiving opening, sidewalls , bottom face and upper face) as a cleaning unit (section 81). The section (81) is provided with a bottom surface (see Fig 11) at the bottom face of the unit or the section (81) has covered bottom face (see Fig 11) covering the bottom face of the receivling openings (recession). As such Hasebe et al meet claim 1 limitation as amended. Hasebe et al's device is also capable of eliminating dregs of the material attached on the slit nozzle of the slit coater. For at least the reasons described above the examiner maintains the rejections of Akimoto and Hasebe et al alone and/or in view of Park et al or Sakai et al .

A handwritten signature consisting of stylized initials and a surname.